

Northern Division

RECEIVED

Jimmy Frank Cameron  
Plaintiff

V.

JULY 23 A 9:37

DE  
U  
ME

CASE NO. 2:07-CV-35-WHA

TROY KING  
MEGAN LAW

Respondent

### OBJECTION TO MAGISTRATES Recommendations

COME NOW Jimmy Frank Cameron in The above style cause and does SAY that He is still being Punished Every Day Because OF The MEGAN LAW! Plaintiff SAYS that NO Summary Judgement should be Granted To The Defendants! A Court should NOT Grant A Motion To Dismiss UNLESS it APPEARS beyond Doubt The Plaintiff CAN Prove NO set OF facts IN support OF his claim which would Intitle him To Relief Conley v Estelle Gibson 355 U.S. 41-45-46 78 5 CT 99 2 Ld 2d 80 1957 Rommel v Estelle 445 U.S. 263 268 100 5 CT 1135 63 L 382 (1980) Like Plaintiff WAS NOT Guilty OF said Charge OF Crime against NATURE if Plaintiff would have Testied in his own Defense, He would have been found NOT Guilty To The said Charge OF Crime Against NATURE. A Petitioner must Show That The Results OF The Proceedings would have been different are That a Reasonable Probability The Results would have been different, Henderson v Haley 353 F.2d AT 892 Plaintiff Shows That He suffered The Hardship OF staying in Prison because OF Being Labeled a sex offender! Plaintiff Shows That it would Be A Miscarriage OF Justice To Dismiss his civil Action see, Plaintiff Does say That if He would have Testied in his own Defense. He would not be Labeled A sex offender! AT ALL! Plaintiff SAY That it would be A Miscarriage OF Justice if A Petitioner Shows That it more Likely Than Not That no Reasonable Juror would have convicted him OF The underlying offense Schulp v DeLo 513 U.S. 298 327 115 5 CT 851 130 Ld 808 (1995) Plaintiff WAS Tricked INTO not Testifying in his own Behalf. Plaintiff will Show by The community Notification ACT it SAY: it should examine whether The Elements OF The Crime Listed in section 15-20-21 3-A.K which it does. But Just because The statute say I AM a sex offender. Does not make me a sex offender! See Holt v. State. This COURT SAY That I face NO Hardship

from This Court. Defendant's Review of His Challenge was because of The Denying of Review Plaintiff is not going any where his Parole was Denied because of being Labeled a sex offender There is not To much more of A That Plaintiff could be put Through." Other than keeping him in Prison by Denying his Parole excluding ALL The other ways Plaintiff is Punished from The MEGAN LAW Daily. The MEGAN LAW in it self is unconstitutional by Labeling some ONE with a 25 year old sex crime as a sex offender. Plaintiff can see Labeling a child molester are a Rapist are some one who masturbates while Looking at any female. These are sex offenders I not Plaintiff I are Like These inmate who Mentally Rape The female officer here at Bullock by masturbating in front of The. (Violation of Rule 38) All They get is A Slap on their wrist.

5-20-07

Jimmy F. Cornen

# Certificate of Service

Come now Jimmy F Cameron and Does say that a copy of the FBI going was sent to TREY KING by placing a copy in the Free Legal mail on this 20<sup>th</sup> Day of May 2007. properly addressed.

State of Alabama  
Attorney General  
11 south union st  
Montgomery Ala

36130-0152

5-20-07

Jimmy Cameron  
Plaintiff

Montgomery, Alabama 36101  
PO Box 5107 E-1-7-17  
Tulsa Spring Ala  
36089

LEGAL  
MAIL

36101+0711



02 1M  
0004219410 MAY 22 2007  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 36089  
**\$00.41<sup>0</sup>**

United States District Court

PO Box 711

Montgomery, Ala

36101-0711

